



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,894	05/22/2001	Mitsuhiro Nakamura	09792909-5022	9845
33448	7590	02/07/2003	EXAMINER	
ROBERT DEPKE HOLLAND + KNIGHT 55 W. MONROE CHICAGO, IL 60603			RODRIGUEZ, ISABEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2836	DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/862,894	NAKAMURA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Isabel Rodriguez	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2001.

2) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 08/22/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,4-6,9-10,13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuzuki et al. (US 4,760,434).
 - a) Regarding claims 1 and 5, Tsuzuki et al. discloses a protection circuit (Fig. 10) for a field effect transistor (22) for protection against a surge breakdown comprising a diode array (73) in which a plurality of forward direction first diodes and reverse direction second diodes are cascade-connected wherein a gate electrode of the FET is grounded through the diode array.
 - b) Regarding claims 4 and 10, Tsuzuki et al. discloses the FET is a junction FET. See col. 3 lines 35-41.
 - c) Regarding claim 6, Tsuzuki et al. discloses the semiconductor device is formed on a compound semiconductor substrate. See col. 1 lines 49-51.
 - d) Regarding claim 9, Tsuzuki et al. discloses the diode includes a first conductivity type first impurity introduction layer formed in a substrate and a second conductivity type second impurity introduction layer provided opposite to the first impurity introduction. See col. 6 lines 49-53.

e) Regarding claims 13-15, Tsuzuki et al. discloses a protection circuit (Fig. 10) for a field effect transistor (22) for protection against a surge breakdown comprising a diode array (73) in which a first diode has an anode connected to the gate electrode, a second diode has an anode connected to the cathode of the first diode, a third diode has an anode connected to the cathode of the second diode, and a fourth diode has an anode connected to the cathode of the third diode. See Fig. 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki et al. in view of Voldman et al. (US 6,433,985).

a) Regarding claims 2 and 8, Tsuzuki et al. discloses a protection circuit of a FET according to claim 1, wherein the diode is a silicon p-n junction diode. Tsuzuki et al. does not disclose that the diode is a Schottky diode including a Schottky electrode. Voldman et al. discloses an ESD protection circuit including diodes that can be chosen to be any commonly known diodes including Schottky diodes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Schottky diodes because it would be equivalent

to use the Schottky diode and thus would not affect the function of the ESD protection circuit.

See col. 2 lines 36-39.

b) Regarding claim7, Tsuzuki et al. discloses a semiconductor device as described in claim 6 with a substrate composed of Silicon. See col. 3 lines 42-45. Tsuzuki does not disclose that the substrate is made of gallium arsenate (GaAs). Voldman discloses a semiconductor composed of any semiconductor known compound such as GaAs or silicon germanium, thus establishing equivalency between both compounds. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use GaAs instead of a silicon compound because it has been proven to be equivalent and shall not change the function of the function of the device. The selection of known equivalents would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki et al

Tsuzuki et al. discloses the semiconductor device according to claim 5 in which protection is provided to a junction field effect transistor. Tsuzuki et al. does not disclose that the FET is a Schottky barrier gate transistor nor a hetero junction field effect transistor. The examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of Schottky barrier gate transistor, a hetero junction field effect transistor and a field effect transistor for their use in the semiconductor protection art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any kind of transistor in order to provide protection against ESD to any equivalent transistor.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isabel Rodriguez whose telephone number is 703-305-4761. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on 703-308-3119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7724 for regular communications and 703-308-7704 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

IR
January 16, 2003



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2836